



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,921	04/26/2001	Alan R. Peterson	P1403USC2	3534
7590	11/30/2006			EXAMINER VO, TED T
JAMES C. SCHELLER, JR. BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025			ART UNIT 2191	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/844,921	PETERSON ET AL.
	Examiner Ted T. Vo	Art Unit 2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 19-21 and 23-39 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 19-21, 23-39 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 09/18/2006.

Claims 19-21, 23-39 remain pending in the application.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Regarding the argument to the rejection of Claims 23-27, 30-31, 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph:

The argument fails to point out the teaching in the specification that covers the "computer readable medium", identified as a new subject matter. The claim terms should be construed to encompass all consistent meanings described within the specification.

The effective filing date of this application is in 1994. The Fig. 1 shows a standard structure of a computer with a memory and an external storage. The Fig. 2 shows only layers of software under development and stored only in the memory of the standard computer before 1994 in the Figure 1. No word "mass" is associated with "external storage".

Furthermore, Applicants fail to point out the teachings that are consistent to the "computer readable medium" as they newly added in. Nowhere in the specification refers the external storage of FIG. 2 as "computer readable medium", a current time term that includes remote storage connected via Internet, high-density memory. Nowhere in the specification that says the external storage as in FIG. 2 is mass, where it is known that with a sophisticated application it requires high memory density in which an external floppy disk cannot be suitable for using. Nowhere in this specification discusses a functionality or an activity in which the technologies of the 94 or before could support the current time "computer readable medium", where this limitation is lately added in the scope of the claim: *A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions for causing a computer to perform the following method.*

Regarding the argument to the rejection of Claims 23, 28-31 as being anticipated by Hamakawa.

et al., for the limitation: *determining automatically which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria*. See p. 279, left col., last full paragraph, "On each playback task method invocation, the context object checks current real time by the gettimeofday system call and decides which frame in the video should be displayed (recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria));

Regarding, *and playing back a sequence of only those determined recorded actions in chronological order on an output device* (See Fig 12 that is playing back a sequence based on the context object check as described). The Applicants assertion of "A frame is not an action". However, Applicant is unable to discuss the distinction. In the specification, the record actions point to class list the presents action played in the multimedia. In the reference, the frames are the actions associated with objects representing the media data and actions. For example, within p. 279, "On each playback task method invocation, the context object checks current real time by the gettimeofday system call and decides which frame in the video should be displayed reads the plain limitation: *determining automatically which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria*, where Applicants fail to provide an adequate distinction.

Note: Claim 28 has the limitation that is not different from Claim 23 in term of functionality. While Applicants use a plain language "action", "preset criterion" in the claim and they fail to provide adequate distinction from the "Actions" does in the reference, such as constraints (p. 275) that shows as an instruction for detecting conditions, acted in a playback action; an act of the computer run upon the selection acting based upon "select-Object"; or the selecting the play icon of the Multimedia.

Regarding the argument to the rejection of Claims 19-21, 23-39 anticipated by Hardman et al:

Claim 19 merely recites:

*determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions (see p. 286, left column: walking route sequence, within hierarchy view, the author can select any object);*

*determining whether an explanation accompanies an action.*

It should be noted that the reference provides the user to manipulate the multimedia presentation via hierarchy view.

Hardman discloses a playing order of nodes ("an action class list") authorized by a user has means of determining which events and sequences of events constitute action via the editor. The manipulation rearranges events in a playing order of nodes so that when the multimedia player playing, it will determine which events and sequence of media objects will be record in a play back duration. Therefore, within a plain limitation as recited, this act of the reference performed with these functions reads the plain limitation.

With regards to, "*determining whether an explanation accompanies an action*", the limitation is also plain. The reference shows much more details than the plain language of the claim, i.e., it reads the plain limitation. The reference discloses that object/node is associated with information presenting the media type of the object/node, including text, image audio and video so that when playing, the author will determine a media type of the object/node, whether it a text, image, audio, video, or the video accompanied with audio, and thus will play accordingly (See p. 285 sec. 4. Figure 1 is an example of video accompanied with text). For example, if the type is audio, it would be determined then playback include sound, if the type is with text, it would implement text information (such as shown in Figure 1, p. 285). The reference discloses every object/node is accompanied attributes included with information to explain that object/node (p. 286, left col. Within paragraph, "Within the hierarchical view..."). The author of the reference can also determine data node or composite node, etc.

Regarding claim 23, it recites

*determining automatically which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria and playing back a sequence of only those determined recorded actions in chronological order on an output device*, clearly, the limitation is plain. With the teachings in Figure 3, which is playing the order of placing nodes using walking route, and in sec. 4.1.2 which shows the authoring in the hierarchy view, the teachings read the plain limitations such as "*recorded actions*", "*specified arbitrary criteria*", "*chronological order*".

Applicants fail to point out an adequate distinction.

Note: The claimed limitations are plain, the Applicants argument fail to point out an adequate distinction, thus with such a plain limitation as recited, it is read by the functions performed perform in the reference.

Note: Other claims such as 24-26, 28, 30, 32, 35-36, 39, each has the limitation that is not different from Claim 19 and 23 in term of functionality. Applicants' arguments remain amounting to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the plain languages of the claims patentably distinguish them from the reference. Particularly, the arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111 (b) (c), because the patentable features have not been point out in the remarks.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 23-27, 30-31, 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This application has an effective filing date on 09/30/1994. The speciation does not describe "computer readable medium having stored thereon executable computer program instructions" where the term computer readable medium used in the later technology includes very a high memory density such as CD ROM, Flash memory, or extendable memory devices, wired/wireless media, which were not common in 1994 or not mentioned in the specification. Clearly, the specification does not cover or describe how the recorder related to "computer readable medium". Since this application is pending for a long period of time, the feature "computer readable medium having stored thereon executable computer program instructions" is clearly a "new subject matter", added in the claims to cover the activity existed

after the effective filing date of this application. Nowhere in the specification, this feature, "computer readable medium" can be seen.

Applicants would be respectfully request deleting "new subject matter". A subject matter in a claim must be preceded in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 23, 28-31, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamakawa et al., "Object Composition and Playback Models for Handling Multimedia Data", Proceedings of the first ACM International Conference on Multimedia, Pages: 273-281, August 1993.

As per claim 23: Hamakawa discloses, *displaying a starting state of multimedia content (See Figure 9); determining automatically which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria (See p. 279, left col., last full paragraph, "On each playback task method invocation, the context object checks current real time by the gettimeofday system call and decides which frame in the video should be displayed (recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria));*

*and playing back a sequence of only those determined recorded actions in chronological order on an output device (See Fig 12 that is playing back a sequence based on the context object check as described).*

As per Claims 28, 30: The claims recite the limitation that has the functionality corresponding to the Claim 23. See rationale addressed in Claim 23 above.

As per Claims 29, 31: Hamakawa discloses one action from the recorded action is accompanied by the recorded explanations, the recorded explanations along with recorded action. See Figure 7, p. 288.

7. Claims 19-21, 23-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardman et al., "Structure Multimedia Authoring", Proceedings of the first ACM International Conference on Multimedia, Pages: 283-289, August 1993.

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification.

As per Claim 19: Hardman discloses,

A method for recording and reviewing actions performed during development of software content created using a tool on a computer system having a processor and memory, said method comprising: receiving one or more user events (See Figure 3, Walking route/playing order of nodes. notes: events); determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions (see p. 286, left column: walking route sequence, within hierarchy view, the author can select any object); determining whether an explanation accompanies an action (see p. 286, left column, note names, explicit duration, comment. See right column, table of contents) ; recording the determined actions; and recording the determined explanations such that a recorded explanation of a recorded action is associated with the recorded action.

See sec. 4.3.

As per Claim 20: Hardman discloses,

*receiving a user request for playback of recorded actions (Figure 3: places);  
accessing recorded actions and associated recorded explanations; and  
playing back recorded actions and any associated recorded explanations.*

(See Figure 3, Playing order of nodes).

As per Claim 21: Hardman discloses,

*determining whether as explanation accompanies an action includes prompting a user for an explanation with respect to an action being recorded. (See sec. 4.3)*

As per claim 23: Hardman discloses,

*displaying a starting state of multimedia content (See Figure 1, p. 285, see Figure 2, the root; see Figure 7, from beginning, to end);*

*determining automatically which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria (See p. 286, sec. 4.1.2; see Figures 3-4: places, for example, specifying a table of contents, for example, specifying Canal1, canal2, etc. , see sec. 4.3, allow to select which channels; see sec. 4.3, allow the author to play any part of the presentation);*

*and playing back a sequence of only those determined recorded actions in chronological order on an output device (and See Figure 3, it is playing the order of placing nodes using walking routes; also see sec. 4.1.2).*

As per claim 24: Hardman discloses, *A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions for causing a computer to perform a method comprising: receiving a user event; determining whether said received user event indicates a playback request; and if said received user event indicates a playback request, then determining automatically which recorded actions to play back by determining which recorded actions meet a specified arbitrary criteria and playing back those determined recorded actions*

*and if said received user event does not indicate a playback request, then determining whether there is an action to record and recording the action if it is determined that there is an action to record.*

See rationale as addressed in the claim 19.

As per claim 25: Hardman discloses, *A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions for causing a computer to perform the following method: receiving a user event; determining whether said received user event indicates a playback request; and if said received user event indicates a playback request, then determining automatically which recorded actions to play back by determining which recorded actions meet a specified fixed criteria, said fixed criteria being selectable from a plurality of fixed criteria, and playing back those determined recorded actions and if said received user event does not indicate a playback request, then determining whether there is an action to record and recording the action if it is determined that there is an action to record. See Figure 1, and sec. 4; furthermore, see rationale as addressed in the claim 19.*

Art Unit: 2191

As per claim 26: Hardman discloses, A computer-readable medium having stored thereon executable computer program instructions, the executable computer program instructions including an action class list and, when executed by a digital processing system, causing the system to perform a method for playback of actions from the action class list, wherein: the action class list comprises a plurality of action class description fields (See Figure 3, playing order of nodes), each action class description field having a first field containing data which specifies a particular action class and a second field containing data which specifies a generic explanation of the action specified in the corresponding first field, whereby the action class list is used during playback of an action to determine an explanation associated with the action class of the action and to accompany the played back action with the determined explanation (See Figure 7, e.g., the information in the boxes relates to a recording action Canal2, as selected from Walking route of Figure3).

As per claim 27: Hardman discloses, A computer-readable medium as defined in claim 26 wherein said second field identifies a software routine capable of producing an explanation based upon properties of a recorded action. See Figure 7.

As per claim 28: Hardman discloses, A method for playing back actions recorded during development of content created using a tool on a computer system having a processor, memory and an output device, the tool having a user-selectable playback initiating mechanism for initiating the playback, said method comprising: displaying a starting state of the content; and playing back recorded actions in chronological order on said output device, an action from said recorded actions comprising a sequence of at least one event, wherein said at least one event is selected to constitute said action based on a preset criterion.

See related rationale addressed in Claim 23.

As per claim 29: Hardman discloses, The method of claim 28, wherein: at least one action from said recorded actions is accompanied by an explanation and said playing back further comprises playing back any associated recorded explanations along with recorded actions. See p. 288, sec. 4.3; see Fig. 7.

As per claim 30: Hardman discloses, A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions for causing a computer to perform the following method:

displaying a starting state of content; and

Art Unit: 2191

*playing back recorded actions in chronological order on an output device, an action from said recorded actions comprising a sequence of at least one event, wherein said at least one event is selected to constitute said action based on a preset criterion.*

See related rationale addressed in Claim 23.

As per claim 31: Hardman discloses, *The computer-readable medium of claim 30, wherein: at least one action from said recorded actions is accompanied by an explanation and said playing back further comprises playing back any associated recorded explanations along with recorded actions.*

See p. 288., sec. 4.3, see Fig. 7.

As per claim 32: Hardman discloses, *An apparatus for playing back actions performed during development of content created using a multimedia creation tool on a computer system having a processor and memory, said apparatus comprising: a user interface means for receiving user events, receiving user requests for playback of actions and displaying recorded actions; and a playback module coupled to said user interface module for receiving user request for playback of recorded actions and for displaying playback of recorded actions, an action from said recorded actions comprising a sequence of at least one event, wherein said at least one event is selected to constitute said action based on a preset criterion, said playback in response to such a user request playing back recorded actions.*

See rationale addressed in Claim 19 above.

As per claim 33: Hardman discloses, *The apparatus of claim 32, wherein: at least one action from said recorded actions is accompanied by an explanation and said playing back further comprises playing back any associated recorded explanations along with recorded actions.*

See rationale addressed in Claim 20 above.

As per claim 34: Hardman discloses, *The apparatus of claim 32, wherein: said playback is based on determining automatically which recorded actions satisfy a specified arbitrary criteria. See Figures 2-3, placing of notes is arbitrarily selected by the author.*

As per claim 35: Hardman discloses, *A method for recording and reviewing actions performed during development of content created using a tool on a computer system having a processor and memory, said method comprising: receiving user events; determining which events and sequences of events constitute*

*actions; and recording the determined actions rather than recording the individual events constituting those actions.*

See rationale addressed in Claim 19 above.

As per claim 36: Hardman discloses, *A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions for causing a computer to perform the following method: receiving user events; determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions; and recording the determined actions rather than recording the individual events constituting those actions.* See Figures 1-3, and sec. 4; furthermore, see rationale as addressed in the claim 19.

As per claim 37: Hardman discloses, *The computer-readable medium of claim 36, wherein the operations further comprising:*

*determining whether an explanation accompanies an action; and recording the determined explanations such that a recorded explanation of a recorded action is associated with the recorded action.*

See rationale as addressed in the claim 20.

As per claim 38: Hardman discloses, *The computer-readable medium of claim 36, wherein: said determining comprises determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions by applying one of a plurality of granularities, said one of a plurality of granularities being selected based on criteria, whereby said applied one of a plurality of granularities varies depending on the criteria.*

See Figures 1-3.

As per claim 39: Hardman discloses, *An apparatus for recording and reviewing actions performed during development of content created using a tool on a computer system having a processor and memory, said apparatus comprising: a user interface means for receiving user events which occur during development of content; and a recorder module coupled to receive user events from said user interface means, said recorder module determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions and recording those actions, said recorder module capable of recording an explanation for each individual action, said explanations being recorded in a manner which associates a recorded explanation of a recorded action with the recorded action.*

See Figures 2-3, and 7.

**Conclusion**

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3706. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM to 4:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708.

The facsimile number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is the Central Facsimile number **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TTV  
November 24, 2006

  
TED VO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100